

“Democracy or Tyranny?” excerpt from page 2 of State Hornet 1966-07-15

International Notes

DEMOCRACY OR TYRANNY?

By Omar Ken Ramkumar

History often has a pattern of repeating itself because human nature is always the same, whether it appears in Romans, Mongolians, Moors, English, Germans or Americans. What goes on in Vietnam today? Does it smack of democracy or rather of tyranny?

While I contemplate this highly emotional and controversial issue, innocent babes and aged Vietnamese are slaughtered like in the days of Herod. This time it is not by swords but by sophisticated machine-guns and bombs.

Is Vietnam really an offshoot of the manifest-destiny theory or the domino-block theory? Is America's role really justifiable? This is a highly flammable topic and one must view the situation dispassionately and rationally.

Perhaps my sympathy is for the afflicted Vietnamese chiefly because of my humanistic and Christian education rather than my having been a subject of a once-colonial country. Let's be realistic. I am speaking of the human factor involved. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were demolished. Was this not an act of tyranny or, to say the least, of retaliation. "Well," the argument goes: "Why did the Japs bomb Pearl Harbor?" And so round and round we go.

To pluck the heart of the mystery is to speculate whether Vietnam would be another sort of Cuba. Is the US fighting a losing cause. — In other words, what happens if there is a referendum in South Vietnam tomorrow and they vote that all aliens must go. What then?

I would suppose that the Pentagon would not for a single moment entertain such a notion. However, one must not forget that the military might of Rome was ineffective against the enthusiasm and dogma of the early Christians. Now the real nature of this struggle would appear to me to be one of political and ideological overtones. To say at the least that it is solely a military affair would be first degree absurdity. The military might of the USA is too far superior to give credibility to such a naive notion. So delicate is the nature of this dispute that diplomacy in large doses is necessary.

Would the US abide by the Geneva Treaty of 1954? It seems unlikely. Would the Viet Cong leave the South Vietnamese alone? I doubt it. Thus there is a dilemma here. Can there be a viable solution?

The most desirable objective should be to win the Vietnamese people, both South and North, over to the Western idea of democracy. This solution must be subtle rather than aggressive.

When we look back at Bunker Hill and Gettysburg, we see that Americans once faced great and grave odds, which they overcame. Can the Vietnamese overcome too? This is the question. Yes, I firmly believe that these gullible and unfortunate people should be let alone to work out their own destiny. If they fail, then the next move should be made by a legitimate body such as the United Nations. Perhaps, this Vietnam issue is a trasymachian bone of contention; that might is always right – dead right.